

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 21-32 remain in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled, Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form in view of the Examiner's indication that this claim is directed to allowable subject matter, and new Claims 22-32 have been added which are believed to patentably define over the prior art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested since none of the prior art discloses the present invention.

More particularly, Claim 22, and Claims 23-25 which depend therefrom, are directed to a method for subjecting a test subject to an acoustical field. Claim 26, and Claims 27-32 which depend therefrom are directed to an acoustical test cell apparatus for subjecting a test subject to an acoustical field. Claims 22-25 patentably defines over the prior art of record, either singly or in combination, in reciting the steps of supplying a chamber encompassing a test volume, supplying another chamber encompassing a test volume, interconnecting the input volume and the test chamber with a tuning port which forms a Helmholtz resonator, positioning a test subject within the test volume, and applying a periodic acoustical signal into the input volume which is coupled to the test volume through the tuning port which forms the Helmholtz resonator whereby a test subject in the test volume is subjected to a periodic acoustical field while the test volume is isolated from the acoustic energy source. An object of the method of Claims 22-25 is to achieve an acoustical field within the test volume while substantially, if not completely, preventing sounds external to the chambers. Claims 26-32 likewise patentably define over the prior art of record, either singly or in combination, by include similar structural limitations to those recited above for the method claims. An object of the method Claims 22-25 and the apparatus Claims 26-32 is to achieve an acoustical field for subjecting a test subject within the test volume to that acoustical field while substantially, if not completely, preventing sounds external to the chambers.

The Polk patent primarily relied upon in the rejection of the claims is directed to a loudspeaker system and a method for emanating sounds from a loudspeaker system. This is the completely opposite objective to the external sound suppression achieved by use of applicants' method as set forth in Claims 22-25 and applicants' acoustical test cell apparatus as set forth in Claims 26-32. Claims 22-32 are concerned with generating an internal acoustical field, while suppressing all external sound. Polk is not concerned with suppressing sounds external to the loudspeaker, for such an objective would render Polk's loudspeaker useless for its intended purpose. Further, the Polk loudspeaker is not used in conjunction with a test subject introduced within an internal volume of the loudspeaker, and does not subject a test subject to an acoustical test. Further, although Polk discloses a tuning port and internal volumes 12 and 13, Polk does not disclose input and test volumes, and the Polk tuning port connects volume (13) to the outside world, not to volume 12. Polk's chamber/test volume is not isolated from the "source flow" as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Claims 22-25 are considered patentable over the Polk patent.

The remaining prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of the originally filed claims has been considered but does not overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Polk.

For the above reasons, Claims 21-32 are believed allowable over the prior art of record and an early notice to such effect is solicited.

October 21, 2005

Edward L Stolarun  
EDWARD L. STOLARUN  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 25,515  
US Army Research Laboratory  
Telephone (703) 806-8244